PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE PROGRAM REVIEW

June, 1988

Report prepared by Julie Devon Dodd for the Prince Edward Island Department of Justice. This report does not necessarily represent or express the views of the Department of Justice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is extended to all people who participated in the review of programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre:

- to the people resident at the Centre on February 29, 1988 who told their stories, made suggestions, and many who took responsibility for their behaviour as inmates,

- to the staff at the Provincial Correctional Centre and the Prince County Jail who risked expressing their views honestly, demonstrating a commitment to improving programs at the Correctional Centre, and responsibility for improving their work lives,

- to the many community people who volunteer or give that extra effort in their jobs, for their suggestions,

- and to the people who participated in the program review meeting, demonstrating a forum for shared commitment and ideas beyond the differences each group brings to their work.

Special thanks is offered to Phil Arbing, Director of Community and Correctional Services; John Bruce, Manager, Custody Programs; and Preston Robbins, Superintendent, Provincial Correctional Centre, who provided files, information, and access to people and the Correctional Centre establishing an atmosphere of respect and openess for the process of the review.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary . . . . . (i)

Purpose of the Report 1

Background 3

Process of the Program Review 15

Programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre 17

Results of Interviews 22

- Inmates 23
- Staff 30
- Community 37

Program Review Meeting 45

Summary of Information and Issues 53

Recommendations for Consideration 60

- Areas for Immediate Consideration 60
- Strategy for Long-term Program Development 64

Concluding Comments 78

Appendix A - Questionnaires

Appendix B - Community Organizations Represented

Appendix C - Program Review Meeting Agenda

Appendix D - List of Meeting Participants

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Prince Edward Island Department of Justice contracted with Julie Devon Dodd in February, 1988 to review the programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre. The purpose of the review was to provide the Department of Justice with information about programs currently operating at the Correctional Centre, the needs of current inmates, and future programming options. The process of the review involved staff, inmates, and concerned community members.

The Correctional Centre Program Review reports on:

- background information gathered from a review of reports,
- describes the process of the program review,
- outlines the programs currently operating at the Correctional Centre,
- summarizes programming issues,
- suggests areas for immediate consideration, and
- proposes an overall strategy for development of a model rehabilitation program.

Background

The Provincial Department of Justice administers three adult correctional facilities. Persons admitted to the correctional facilities are held for one of three reasons: sentenced admission, lock-up admissions, and others

including remand and transfer. The length of sentence ranges from one day to two years less a day. Earned remission time permits release after two-thirds of a sentence is served, and inmates are eligible for parole release after one-third of the sentence.

Prior to the opening of the Correctional Centre, three county jails located in Charlottetown, Summerside, and Georgetown provided custodial services. The Correctional Centre replaced the Queens County Jail in 1979 and provided modern and expanded facilities for the province based on a principle of corrections guided by the social sciences.

"The design of the Correctional Centre committed the Department of Justice to a certain mode of operation. Security in this centre is dependent upon the presence of staff....staff must be present to operate programs which provide dynamic security." (1)

During 1987, there were 2,186 admissions to the Provincial Correctional Centre, who served a total of 32,169 days - an average of 14.7 days including all inmates, and 28.6 days for sentenced inmates. While overall the number of prisoner days in adult facilities increased by 11.9% in 1987, the Provincial Correctional Centre experienced an increase of 20.9%, attributed in part to the conversion of Kings County

1 In House Study, Sleepy Hollow Correctional Centre, September, 1979, Section I, pp.5-6

Jail to young offender use. Records and impressions for the first four months of 1988, indicate a decrease in the overall number of admissions to the Provincial Correctional Centre.

Provincial correctional facilities are governed by the Jails Act and Regulations. New legislation, the Corrections Act is awaiting proclamation, pending development of regulations.

Process of the Program Review

The desire to better understand the programs presently operating at the Centre and their relationship to inmate needs, along with the desire to include institutional staff as well as community members resulted in a "process approach" - a series of related steps:

- initial interviews were held with key institutional personnel to get a description of present programs,
- questionnaires were developed and interviews conducted with forty inmates, thirty-two correctional centre staff, and twenty-six community representatives,
- a discussion paper summarizing the results of these interviews was circulated with a response form,
- twenty-eight people representing administration, staff, and community participated in a full-day program review meeting, and
- this final report completes the process.

Programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre

Programs at the Correctional Centre include activities that happen within the facility, on the grounds, and in the community. Activities include work, education, recreation, and other. Residents in the maximum unit participate in the gym program and unit cleaning only, and female residents are limited to the laundry program. In-House programs are limited by the space at the facility, and community programs often experience problems of transportation and supervision.

Results of Interviews

Thirty-eight male and two female inmates, resident at the Correctional Centre on February 29, 1988, and willing to talk with the interviewer, were interviewed during the following week. Information may not necessarily represent the seventy-three inmates resident on that day. The following, highlights characteristics of the thirty-eight male inmates:

- average age was 27.6 years,
- average reported education of grade 9.7,
- half (19) came from Queens County,
- 22 people were sentenced for property offences, 6 for offences causing personal injury, 6 for impaired driving, and 4 were on remand,
- 23 people were previously incarcerated, including six in federal penitentiaries, and

- over 90% reported using alcohol or drugs on the day of the offence.

When asked what programs inmates would like to see at the Centre, the most frequently mentioned were:

- alcohol and drug addiction,
- work, including work for money, more community work programs,
- counselling, and
- education.

Of the twenty-nine staff interviewed at the Provincial Correctional Centre, twenty-two were men, and seven women. Their job classifications were Correctional Officers I, II, III, and IV, Classification Officer, Food Services Manager, Cook, and Nurse. Staff program ideas included education, community service work and other work. Several staff mentioned a full-time rehabilitation program with counselling, assessment, and case-planning. Regarding training many staff consider training in human relations/ counselling as necessary to improve their effectiveness.

Twenty-six community people, with some relationship to the Correctional Centre as volunteers or through employment, were interviewed. The most frequently mentioned program recommendation was education, and other comments included suggestions about staffing, facilities, and drugs.

Program Review Meeting

Twenty-eight people attended a full-day program review meeting on May 6, 1988. The purpose of the meeting was to identify and develop program ideas for Department of Justice consideration. Ideas were developed in the areas of 1)Case Planning, 2)Education, 3)Addictions, 4)Counselling, and 5)Employment, Community Service and Leisure. Barriers to improved programming were identified, including drug availability, and lack of sufficient and qualified staff for programming and case planning.

Summary of Information and Ideas

Three major factors influence programs at the Correctional Centre - inmates, staff, and the system. The Provincial Correctional Centre is the primary rehabilitation institution in the province with a relationship to the broader criminal justice system, and the community. A correctional centre is a relatively closed system with highly controlled movement, and negative attitudes, the result of lack of choice in people residing there. Consideration of programs in the provincial correctional system must include the rehabilitation needs of inmates, the training and job satisfaction needs of staff, recognize the atmosphere imposed by a negative closed system, and encourage a relationship to the larger community.

The initial principle of dynamic security based on inmate/staff relationships and rehabilitation programs does not appear to have been supported by sufficient staff training and program direction, resulting now in a lack of intention or planning in relation to inmates and programs. The problem areas most frequently identified during interviews and the program review meeting are related to:

- inmate needs - alcohol and drug addiction, individual and group counselling, and basic education,
- staff development - training, morale, and opportunities for personal growth, and
- the institutional system - a rehabilitation program with a case management approach, drug control, and scheduling of volunteer programs.

Recommendations for Consideration

The recommendations for consideration are in two areas:

- areas for immediate consideration including control of drugs, scheduling of existing programs, review of classification and point systems, and staff training, and
- a strategy for long term development of a rehabilitation model with the goal of reducing the number of repeat offenders.

Areas for Immediate Consideration

1. A simple sentence planning form should be developed by the classification officer and completed within two weeks of admission for inmates serving sixty days or more. This

sentence planning form would be the basis for discussion and decision making at weekly classification meetings.

2. The basic purpose and effectiveness of the point system should be reviewed to determine if staff are aware of and use guidelines for awarding points and, also to establish if the point system is completed on an objective and regular basis.

3. It is recommended that the Classification Officer identify ongoing programs at the Centre and schedule times and locations to reduce the possibility of conflict of time and space.

4. Drug control through increased security, staff training to identify inmates using drugs, and a review of Correctional Centre policy to ensure clarity and enforcement consequences for illicit drug use.

5. Education and awareness programs for inmates related to drug and alcohol addiction should be made available to all inmates.

6. Regarding staff training, in the short term, it is recommended that consideration be given to short courses of a crisis management nature such as: signs/symptoms and management of alcohol and drug abuse, and signs/symptoms of serious mental disturbance, including suicide prevention.

Strategy for Long-Term Development of a Rehabilitation Program

A dynamic model of custodial corrections would be based on:

- a sentence plan for all inmates,

- an approach for inmate/correctional officer relationship, and

- development of in-house and community programs.

1. It is recommended that the Department of Justice adopt a program development approach to develop a model rehabilitation program for inmates in the provincial correctional system, with the goal of reducing the number of repeat admissions.

2. A one year program development phase is recommended to introduce a dynamic approach to custodial corrections.

3. The program development phase to be guided by a committee of justice administrators, correctional centre staff and community representatives with a mandate and authority to develop the rehabilitation model.

4. Explore federal and provincial government resources to hire a program development person on contract for one year to research and carry-out the work of the committee.

5. Four major activities would take place during the program development phase: living-unit organization, sentence plan development, staffing development, and program development.

6. The delineation of units by security only, should be reviewed with consideration to a move away from the security definition to living units structured by function.

7. An initial sentence plan should be developed for inmates within seven days of their admission.

8. A major shift in emphasis to dynamic security requires that correctional officers participate in the rehabilitation aspect of corrections, and this necessitates training all correctional officers for that role.

9. Rehabilitation programs should be developed based on indvidual needs and identified group needs.

10. Program development at the institution should be the responsibility of a Program Development/Staff Development person in co-operation with Correctional Officers responsible for Sentence Plan Management.

11. Activities that encourage community participation at the Correctional Centre should be introduced.

Concluding Comments

This review has provided the opportunity for input from people most affected, and has involved a process of communication and keeping people informed of the review as it progressed. The Summary and Recommendation sections of this report include the most important areas for consideration in the view of the writer. Many ideas in the Results of Interviews and Program Review Meeting sections are worthwhile, and are recorded for future consideration. The commitment and concern expressed by most staff and community members during the review are an indication of the potential for a dynamic rehabilitation program in the provincial correctional system.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The Prince Edward Island Department of Justice contracted with Julie Devon Dodd in February, 1988 to review the programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre. The purpose of the review was to provide the Department of Justice with information about the programs presently operating at the Correctional Centre, the needs of the current inmates, and future programming options given security requirements. This program review differs from previous studies of the Correctional Centre which reviewed staff and security. Also the process agreed upon to involve staff, inmates, and concerned community members in the review and process for identifying potential program improvements is a unique approach in the criminal justice field.

The Correctional Centre Program Review reports on:

-background information gathered from a review of reports leading up to and following the opening of the Provincial Correctional Centre in 1979,

-describes the process of the program review which included interviews with 40 current inmates, 32 staff, and 26 community representatives, on-going communication with correctional centre staff, and community members, and a full day program review meeting,

-outlines the programs currently operating at the Correctional Centre,

-summarizes programming issues identified during this process,

-suggests areas for immediate consideration, and

-proposes an overall strategy for long term program development.

While the review focussed on the Provincial Correctional Centre, the report considers the overview of adult custodial corrections in the Province, and considers the relationship of the Prince County Jail to the Provincial Correctional Centre. Another focus of the review was the "typical" sentenced offender, although needs of special inmate groups such as remand and women are considered. This review did not consider lock-up admissions and the recent Lock-up Study, November, 1987 reports on that aspect.

The review was conducted solely by Julie Devon Dodd, with direction from Philip Arbing, Director of Community and Correctional Services, and John Bruce, Manager, Custody Programs.

This report is prepared for but does not necessarily express the views or policies of the Provincial Department of Justice.

BACKGROUND

The Provincial Department of Justice administers three adult provincial correctional facilities: King's County Jail, Georgetown; the Provincial Correctional Centre, near Charlottetown; and Prince County Jail, Summerside. The total admission capacity across the province is 142, with 4 at King's County, 40 at Prince County (presently under review), and 98 at the Provincial Correctional Centre.At the time of this review, King's County Jail in Georgetown was functioning as a temporary secure custody centre for Young Offenders, providing overnight lock-up facilities only for adults.

Persons admitted to the correctional facilities are held for one of three reasons: sentenced admissions - persons convicted of an offence, and sentenced by the court to a determined time of incarceration less than two years duration; lock-up admissions - persons held, usually overnight, pending their release or appearance before a justice of the peace; and other admissions including remand (persons held in custody awaiting further court appearance), and transfer (awaiting transfer to a federal penitentiary). The length of sentence to provincial correctional facilities ranges from one day to two years less a day. Under authority of the federal Parole Act, a prisoner is eligible for day parole after serving one-sixth of a sentence, and for full parole after serving one-third of a sentence.

Parole applications take time to process, and are normally considered for sentences exceeding four months. Under provincial and federal laws, earned remission time permits release after two-thirds of the sentence is served.

At the Provincial Correctional Centre the living units are divided by function and security. The admitting unit receives new inmates, records and stores personal belongings, issues clothing, and provides lock-up and segregation functions, since inmates can be under constant visual observation if this is required. The female unit is the residence of all women admitted to the Correctional Centre and is staffed by matrons. Inmates serving sentences longer than sixty days, and remand and transfer inmates are housed in the maximum unit. Sentenced inmates after a period of observation ranging from two to six weeks are transferred to either the minimum or medium units, depending upon length of sentence, offence, and security risk. The medium unit, normally houses longer term inmates, and the minimum unit, normally houses shorter-term or inmates approaching release. Inmates serving sentences of sixty days or less are usually transferred to the medium or minimum unit from admitting.

Prior to the opening of Sleepy Hollow (now known as the Provincial Correctional Centre), in 1979 three county jails located in Charlottetown, Summerside, and Georgetown provided provincial custodial services. These jails were

built between 1908 and 1912, and were designed as lock-up and short stay institutions. The Correctional Centre replaced the Queens County Jail in 1979 and provided modern and expanded physical facilities for the province based on a principle of corrections guided by the social sciences. "A principle of corrections combining the protection of society with the rehabilitation of the offender guided the development of the new centre and was based on the view of contemporary corrections as a resocialization agent."(1)

The physical and program development leading up to the opening of the Correctional Centre was guided by a core group representing Corrections, Social Services, Addictions, Public Works, and Probation, and assisted by K. L. McReynolds Ltd., a design architect from Toronto who had designed several modern correctional centres.

In-House Study, Sleepy Hollow Correctional Centre, conducted in September, 1979, reviewed the correctional system then being developed at Sleepy Hollow and the related costs. This report outlined the philosophy and objectives of corrections and methods intended to direct the Correctional Centre:

PRINCIPLES

> A correctional centre must accept all persons sentenced by the Court to a period of incarceration when the length of sentence is less than two years.

1 K.L. McReynolds Limited, Corrections Prince Edward Island June, 1974, p.30

Principle I

The sentence of the Court constitutes the punishment.

Principle II

The individual is ultimately responsible for his own behaviour.

Principle III

Re-integration of the prisoner into the community is the major emphasis of the correctional centre.

Principle IV

Change in human behaviour is influenced by the behaviour of other humans.

Principle V

The correctional system must operate from a unified philosophy.

THE OBJECTIVES OF CORRECTIONS

The objectives of corrections arise from the two major responsibilities placed upon the correctional system by the expectations of the public. These responsibilities form two objectives which create between them the conflict about the purposes of corrections both in the general public and within the correctional system.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

Re-integration

1. To provide the prisoner with institutional and community program opportunities designed to assist him in the development of daily living skills and confidence to cope with his personal problems and social environment.

Security

2. To ensure the adequate protection of all individuals in society from further anti-social acts by prisoners and to ensure the safety and protection of correctional staff and prisoners.

METHODS

Certain changes must occur within the prison system if objectives of re-integration and security are to be achieved. The end result of these changes become the methods by which the goals of the correctional process are achieved.

1. The creation of program opportunities

2. A classification system

3. Reduction of the effects of the prison sub-culture

4. Create a system of prisoner control (through staff-prisoner relationships)

5. Creation of hope - a system of motivation.(2)

"Security was to be achieved through staff control of prisoners and through a system of three security levels, maximum, medium, and minimum. The security levels were divided almost evenly with 18 rooms in maximum and 24 in both medium and minimum areas."(3) "The design of the correctional centre commits the Department of Justice to a certain mode of operation. Security in this centre depends upon the presence of staff. The completely separate living areas require staff present at all times. Lacking the structural strength in the building necessary to provide static security, staff must be present to operate the programs which provide dynamic security. .....At Sleepy Hollow a correctional officer has a generic role which includes the following functions: security, admitting, living unit supervision, correspondence, recreation,

2 In House Study, Sleepy Hollow Correctional Centre September, 1979,Section I, pp. 3-7
3 ibid, Section II, p. 3

counselling, work crew supervision, and escorting. The job is diverse, engrossing, challenging, and requires capable people to perform it adequately. The job role is designed to increase staff-prisoner contact, to allow staff values to influence prisoner values and to provide dynamic security."(4)

A further review of the Correctional Centre was carried out by IEA Consulting Group Ltd. in 1981 to assess the adequacy of the staff resources to meet the mandate specified in legislation, regulations and policy, and to identify the implications of further reductions.

This report described the offender programs and support services activities in support of the security function at Sleepy Hollow. "Support services include food, health, laundry and stores as well as administrative services. Offender programs centre on activities intended to accomplish the re-integration objective of Corrections.... ...the institution must classify each inmate according to the degree of responsibility he can assume for his behaviour (and hence his security risk), must develop a plan of activities that offers the inmate the opportunity to take increased responsibility for his behaviour, and must continually monitor the progress of the inmate in his

4 ibid, Section I, pp.5-6

participation in program activities. The programs include:

i.) Counselling: By classification staff, psychologists and/or chaplains as appropriate.

ii.) Work/Education: Regular activity during the day with work assignments or academic or vocational education.

iii.) Leisure: Recreation and hobbies.

iv.) Community Relations: Participation with volunteer individuals and groups.

v.) Visits: Visits with approved persons.

Program activities must also be integrated with the temporary absence and day parole methods of gradual release."(5)

In 1981, a Classification Officer and a Programs Officers were responsible for the classification and counselling of inmates and development of inmate programs. The report referenced the ratio of inmate to offender programs staff in federal medium and minimum security institutions in the order of 5 to 1. The ratio at the Correctional Centre at that time was in the order of 30 - 1.(6) The report recommended that the Department re-examine both its objective and budget with respect to offender programs. This section of the report summarized that the current resources employed in offender programs are at a minimal level and not sufficient to achieve departmental objectives

5 I.E.A. Consulting Group, Confidential Report, 1981
6 ibid, Chapter 2, p.4

in this area,(7) and that the low level of offender program activities does not enhance security of the institution.(8) At the present time there is one position, Classification Officer, with a clear mandate for program responsibility.

During 1987, there were 2,186 admissions to the Provincial Correctional Centre, who served a total of 32,169 days. The following tables show Sentence, Remand and Lock-up Admissions, and Total and Average Days Served for the period 1980 - 1987, for the Provincial Correctional Centre (Tables 1, 2, and 3) and for all Adult Provincial Correctional Facilities (Tables 4, 5, and 6).

TABLE # 1
PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE
SENTENCE, REMAND AND LOCK-UP ADMISSIONS
1980-1987

	Sentence	Remand	Lock-up	Total	(9) + ^ or -
1980	803	93	1037	1933	-
1981	667	113	1205	1985	+ 2.6%
1982	617	95	1034	1746	-12.0%
1983	566	88	1089	1743	- .2%
1984	749	84	1291	2124	+21.9%
1985	522	69	1186	1777	-16.3%
1986	796	61	1082	1939	+ 9.1%
1987	974	86	1126	2186	+12.7%

7 ibid, p.31
8 ibid, p.39
9 + increase or - decrease over previous year

TABLE #2
PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE
SENTENCE, REMAND AND LOCK-UP DAYS SERVED
1980-1987

	Sentence	Remand	Combined	Lock-up	Total	% + or -
1980	n/a	n/a	18,261	989	19,250	-
1981	n/a	n/a	23,688	1,399	25,087	+30.3%
1982	n/a	n/a	22,960	1,089	24,049	- 4.1%
1983	n/a	n/a	22,423	1,130	23,553	- 2.1%
1984	(21,705)	(1,571)	23,276	1,397	24,673	+ 4.8%
1985	(20,962)	(1,990)	22,952	1,590	24,542	- .5%
1986	(22,757)	(2,642)	25,399	1,201	26,600	+ 8.4%
1987	(27,899)	(3,041)	30,940	1,229	32,169	+20.9%

TABLE #3
PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE
AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS SERVED PER ADMISSION -
TOTAL ADMISSIONS/SENTENCE/REMAND
1984-1987

	Sentence	Remand	Total (inc.lock-up)
1984	29.0	18.7	11.6
1985	40.2	28.8	13.8
1986	28.6	43.3	13.7
1987	28.6	35.4	14.7

Table #4
ADULT PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES
(Includes Provincial Correctional Centre, Kings and Prince County Jails)
SENTENCE, REMAND AND LOCK-UP ADMISSIONS
1980-1987

	Sentence	Remand	Lock-up	Total	% + or -
1980	876	127	2361	3364	-
1981	878	164	2436	3478	+ 3.4%
1982	790	130	2245	3165	- 9.0%
1983	779	110	2287	3176	+ .3%
1984	992	130	2194	3316	+ 4.4%
1985	909	124	2025	3058	- 7.8%
1986	1573	138	1949	3660	+19.7%
1987	1445	146	1802	3393	- 7.3%

Table #5
ADULT PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES
(Includes Provincial Correctional Centre, Kings and Prince County Jails)
SENTENCE, REMAND AND LOCK-UP DAYS SERVED
1980-1987

	Sentence	Remand	Combined	Lock-up	Total	% + or -
1980	n/a	n/a	18,799	2,433	21,232	-
1981	n/a	n/a	27,035	2,937	29,972	+41.2%
1982	n/a	n/a	25,260	2,354	27,614	- 7.9%
1983	n/a	n/a	23,959	2,380	26,339	- 4.6%
1984	(25,818)	(2,108)	27,926	2,313	30,239	+14.8%
1985	(26,830)	(2,717)	29,547	2,458	32,005	+ 5.8%
1986	(30,365)	(3,583)	33,948	2,620	36,568	+14.3%
1987	(35,066)	(3,889)	38,955	1,956	40,911	-11.9%

Table #6
ADULT PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES
(Includes Provincial Correctional Centre, Kings and Prince County Jails)
AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS SERVED PER ADMISSION -
TOTAL ADMISSIONS/SENTENCE/REMAND
1984-1987

	Sentence	Remand	Total (inc.lock-up)
1984	26.0	16.2	9.1
1985	29.5	21.9	10.5
1986	19.3	26.0	10.0
1987	24.3	26.6	12.1

While overall the number of prisoner days in adult facilities increased by 11.9% in 1987, the Provincial Correctional Centre experienced an increase of 20.9%. This can be attributed in part to the conversion of Kings County Jail to young offender use. Also the drop in admissions in 1985 is due in part to the removal of 16 and 17 year olds to young offender facilities.

This present review did not include an intensive study of trends in the number of admissions and length of stay, however, the information from Annual Reports for the period would indicate in regard to sentence admissions that 1987 showed a significant increase in the number of prisoners admitted, but the average days served for 1984, 1986, and 1987 remained constant at 28. Nineteen-eighty five was an unusual year because of the introduction of Young Offender's

Act to include 16 and 17 year olds, and their transfer from the adult facilities.

Records and impressions for the first four months of 1988, indicate a decrease in the overall number of admissions to the Provincial Correctional Centre. Overcrowding at the Centre was a burdensome problem during 1987 and beds were added. Overcrowding and fluctuating numbers is a factor in programming.

Provincial correctional centres are governed by the Jails Act and Regulations which authorizes the Director of Corrections to determine the centre to which a prisoner is admitted, and the Superintendent of the institution to direct a prisoner to participate in training, treatment or work programs. The Act further designates that this authority extends outside the correctional centre where the prisoner walks, works, etc. New legislation, the Corrections Act is awaiting proclamation pending development of regulations.

PROCESS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW

The desire to better understand the programs presently operating at the centre and their relationship to inmate needs, along with the desire to include institutional staff as well as community members involved at the Correctional Centre in the process of the review and future program ideas, resulted in a "process approach" - a series of related steps - to the program review.

Initial interviews were held with key institutional personnel, Superintendent and Classification Officer, to get a description of programs in operation. A memo was sent from the Director of Community and Correctional Services notifying all correctional centre staff at the Provincial Correctional Centre and the Prince County Jail, and identified community representatives of the review. People were informed that they might be contacted for an interview or they could contact the interviewer to schedule if they desired.

Questionnaires were developed as interview guidelines for the three groups to be interviewed - present inmates, correctional centre staff, and involved community representatives. Forty inmates, thirty-two correctional centre staff, and twenty-six community reprentatives were interviewed.

A discussion paper summarizing the results of these interviews was circulated with a response form to all staff at the Provincial Correctional Centre and the Prince County Jail and to the fifty-two community members initially contacted by memo from the Director of Community and Correctional Services. Staff and community members were asked to review the discussion paper and complete the response form if they had any comments or additions, or if they were interested in attending a full-day program review meeting in response to the discussion paper. Twenty-one people returned the response form, some with additional comments.

Twenty-eight people representing staff and community members attended the program review meeting which was intended to identify and develop program ideas for Department of Justice consideration. A summary of proceedings of the meeting was prepared and sent to participants for their comments.

This final report to the Department of Justice, of the Correctional Centre Program Review completes the process.

PROGRAMS AT THE PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE

Programs at the Correctional Centre include activities that happen within the facility, on the grounds of the Correctional Centre, and in the community. Admission to these programs is through the Classification Officer who keeps a list of program possibilities, indicating which inmates have expressed interest in a specific area. This list is reviewed at weekly classification meetings which include the Deputy Superintendent, the Classification Officer, Correctional Officer III - supervisor, Correctional Officer II from the Maximum Unit, and the Food Services Supervisor.

On admission to the Correctional Centre remand or inmates serving sixty days or more are housed in the maximum unit for security and mental health observation. Within two to six weeks sentenced inmates are transferred to a residential unit depending upon length of sentence and security needs. In the maximum unit, security is tighter, and program participation limited. Usually inmates serving less than sixty days, move from admitting to the medium or minimum units, and are eligible to participate in programs.

The following outlines program activities -

In-House Programs:

Work - cleaning of living units (all inmates)

- cleaning the other areas of the centre, including administration (cleaning crew of 4 supervised by correctional officer))

- kitchen (two shifts of 4 each)

- laundry (females, usually 1 or 2)

- stores (assistance as needed)

(All in-house work programs are supervised by Correctional Centre staff)

Education

- G.E.D. preparation (unsupervised 1-4 people - guidance provided by outside teacher)

- remedial (1-1 assistance provided by Catholic sister)

- computer program (taught by Holland College students - part-time -up to 10 participants [not presently operating])

(All in-house education programs are part-time and conducted by volunteer community members)

Recreation

- gymnasium (each unit has two-one hour blocks of time, e.g. 1:00 - 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 - 8:00 p.m., each day; activities include nautilis equipment, pool table, ping-pong, shuffleboard)

- hobby shop (unsupervised/guided by part-time woodwork instructor)

- films (1 evening a week), bingo (1 evening a week)

(All in-house recreation is supervised by Correctional Centre staff)

Other

- impaired driver education program (5 half-days program mandatory for drinking-driving offenders)
- chaplaincy program (2 services a week, plus individual counselling)
- woodworking shop (part-time 6-8 people)
- A.A. meetings (twice a week)
- health care (a full-time nurse is available daily)

(These programs are conducted by a combination of correctional centre staff, community volunteers and professionals)

On-grounds:

Work - snow shovelling and grounds clean-up as needed (Supervised by Correctional Officers)

Garden - during the summer months a vegetable garden provides fresh produce to the Centre, and donations to community food programs such as the Upper Room (Supervised by Correctional Officers)

Recreation

- ballfield (summer months, includes baseball, horseshoes, track, volleyball)

(Supervised by Correctional Officers)

In community:

Work - Fish and Wildlife (woodlot management and stream improvement - 4 inmates - supervision provided by Fish and Wildlife, Department of Community Affairs)

-Farm Labour (minimum wage paid, employment available as needed - supervision provided by employer)

-community service work (volunteer assistance to seniors and physically disabled, clean-up of Charlottetown cemetery, and other community service activities - supervision usually provided by Correctional Officers, presently by a summer project through the John Howard Society)

Recreation

-community recreation (one morning per week each activity during winter months - hockey, basketball, bowling, rollerskating for up to 12 participants - supervision provided by Correctional Officers)

Other

-A.A. meetings (supervised by community member)

-residential addiction treatment programs on temporary absence

Other activities happen on an individual basis such as attendance at school or employment on temporary absence program, visits from community organizations such as John Howard Society or Native Council, for support and pre-release preparation. In addition special programs, such as First Aid Training by St. John Ambulance or self-esteem building occur on an as planned basis.

Residents in the maximum unit participate in the gym program and living unit cleaning only. Female residents are limited

to the laundry program. Also the physical space of the institution precludes large activities or events. For example the gymnasium is an activity centre rather than a place for team sports. Major problems identified in relation to the programs in the community were transportation and supervision.

RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS

This section presents information collected during interviews with **forty inmates, thirty-two correctional centre staff,** and **twenty-six community representatives.** Interview questionnaires (See Appendix A, Questionnaires) were developed for the three groups and interviews were conducted in person (inmates and staff and some community people), or by telephone.

The results of interviews were prepared in a discussion paper format and distributed to staff at the Provincial Correctional Centre and Prince County Jail and interested community members. The purpose of the discussion paper was to provide feedback to those staff and community people interviewed, and to serve as an animation tool for the program review meeting.

The responses to questionnaires are summarized in the three categories **Inmates, Staff, and Community.** Background information is presented at the beginning of each questionnaire category to provide the reader with some basic information about people answering the questionnaire.

The desire to present the information as reported and to keep the section to a reasonable, readable length, results in the format of listing the comments in general categories and indicating the number of people who made the same or a

similar comment( ), if more than one. Tables are used when this is the simplest format.

Questionnaire Summaries

INMATES

The questionnaire was answered by inmates, willing to talk to the interviewer, who were resident at the Provincial Correctional Centre on Monday, February 29, 1988. Forty of the seventy-three inmates resident on that day were interviewed during the week of February 29th.

A total of 40 questionnaires were completed - in the minimum unit, 13 of 27 inmates, in the medium unit, 10 of 28 inmates, in the maximum unit, 15 of 18 inmates, and in the female unit the 2 women resident on that day. Of the 40 inmates interviewed, 38 were male and 2 female. Inmates were self-selected and all information was self-reported. In the following background information categories, information for male and female is separated due to the low number of women, and because there is no integration of programs.

The ages of the men interviewed ranged from 18 to 51 with the average age being 27.6 years. The women were aged 31 and 24 years. For the 38 males, 24 (63.2%) reported being single, 7 (18.4%) married, and 7 (18.4%) separated or divorced. Both women were married. In terms of education, the highest grade completed, reported by the men, ranged from grade 6 to grade 12, resulting in an average self-

reported education of grade 9.7. Half (19) of the men interviewed came from Queens County with 16 giving Charlottetown as their home community. Ten people came from Prince County, including 5 from Summerside, and 8 came from Kings County. One person gave their home community as out of province.

Present Offence Information

This section presents information about the forty inmates interviewed, and should not be seen as representative of the seventy-three people resident on that day.

Nearly all, 34 (89.9%), men interviewed were serving sentences, including one weekender. The other four were on remand, awaiting return to court.

Most people were sentenced for offences against property, 22 (64.7%), and 6 (17.6%) reported offences causing personal injury. The remaining 6 (17.6%) were sentenced for impaired driving. (This number appears low and it is suspected that since sentences for impaired driving are usually of short duration, these people chose not be be interviewed. Also they may not consider themselves typical inmates.) Of the four remand inmates three were being held for offences against property, and one for a personal injury offence.

The following table shows the month and year of admission and the number of months served for the thirty eight male

inmates to February 29, 1988:

month/year	# of inmates		# of months served
05/86	1	(2.6%)	21 or less
09/86	1	(2.6%)	19 "
02/87	2	(5.3%)	12 "
03/87	1	(2.6%)	11 "
04/87	3	(7.9%)	10 "
05/87	1	(2.6%)	9 "
06/87	2	(5.3%)	8 "
10/87	1	(2.6%)	4 "
12/87	3	(7.9%)	3 "
01/88	6	(15.9%)	2 "
02/88	17	(44.7%)	1 "

(02/88 includes four inmates on remand)

The following table summarizes the length of sentence for the male inmates:

sentence in months	# of inmates	
less than 1	3	(7.9%)
1 to 2+	5	(13.2%)
3 to 5+	3	(7.9%)
6 to 11+	6	(15.8%)
12 to 17+	5	(13.2%)
18 to 23+	12	(31.6%)
remand	4	(10.5%)

Seventeen of thirty-four sentenced inmates were serving sentences longer than twelve months, and the same number were admitted during the preceding month, and had spent less than one month at the Correctional Centre.

Regarding previous incarceration, 23 (60.5%) were previously incarcerated including six people who had served time in federal penitentiaries.

Present sentence information for the two women: they were both serving time for impaired driving - 15 days and six

months, and both were being released during March, 1988. Both had previously been incarcerated.

Alcohol/Drug Use on Day of Offence

Over 90% of the men reported using alcohol and/or drugs on the day of the offence: 16 (47.1%) were using alcohol, 4 (11.8%) were using drugs, and 11 (32.3%) were using both. Only 3 people (8.9%) reported not using drugs or alcohol on the day of the offence. This does not include remand inmates since they were awaiting further court appearance on the charges. Both women were using aclohol.

Background Information

People were asked to indicate from a list of thirteen items, which items were part of their past. Those reported by ten or more inmates are listed:

alcoholic father	-	17 people	(44.8%)
alcohol treatment	-	23 "	(60.5%)
drug treatment	-	14 "	(36.8%)
previous incarceration	-	28* "	(73.7%)
parents separated	-	10 "	(26.3%)
self separated	-	11* "	(29.0%)

(*discrepancy between number reported earlier based on interpretation of the question)

Prior to Incarceration

People were asked about their usual daytime and evening activities prior to incarceration. Most of the men interviewed were unemployed, especially during the winter months and spent time hanging around. Four people indicated they spent their days drinking, one person attended school and ten reported usually working at casual labour. During

the evenings most "hung out", some getting high with friends either at bars or homes. A few sat home and watched television, three attended A.A. meetings regularly, and one worked the night shift.

Activities at Correctional Centre

People were asked to name three activities that took up most of their time at the Correctional Centre. Those activites with five or more responses are: television (25), playing cards (17), gym (10), reading (9), sleeping (8), kitchen (6), woodshop (5). Other activities mentioned are: writing, talking, eating, guitar, pacing, listening to music, A.A.

Why Not Participate?

The reasons stated for non-participation in programs are: want education but teacher only comes in a few days and is too busy, gym too crowded, hard to get in to town recreation - too many people (3), not interested in the activities (4), bored of same things, no money to pay for woodworking/hobby supplies (3), don't want to go to town escorted, staying quiet helps things to go better.

What Helps?

People were asked what happens at the Correctional Centre to help them achieve their plans when they get out. Half said "nothing" (19), six people mentioned alcohol programs and especially the impaired driver program, two people mentioned withdrawal of freedom and time to think. The remainder did not have anything to say to this question.

What Could Help?

When asked what activities or programs they would like to see at the Correctional Centre, most people had some suggestions. Programs related to alcohol and drug addiction were mentioned the most often including: A. A. and D. A. for maximum inmates (4), better control of drugs getting into the Centre so there would be no access, alcohol rehabilitation in addition to the impaired driver program (6), and sentence to treatment. Work was another area mentioned by several inmates; comments included: work for money so there would be something when they got out (6), more community work programs like Fish and Wildlife, farm, community service (4), real work at the Correctional Centre like painting the walls. Other work related comments included more training like the woodwork shop, and referral to Manpower prior to release. Counselling was an area frequently mentioned and included psychiatric help to figure out why people kept coming back (4), small group discussions with community people, "rap sessions" - self-help group counselling (4), programs to look at self and respect for self and others. The area of education ranged from life skills (e.g.how to look for work) training (3) to G.E.D. preparation (4), and other education. Suggestions in the area of sports and recreation were varied such as more gym time, painting and drawing classes, card tournaments, more movies, sports programs involving community. Two

suggestions were related to inmate participation - ask inmates what they want to do instead of telling them, and establish inmate committees to participate in problem solving on the units.

Both women interviewed strongly expressed the opinion that there should be some programs for woman, other than the laundry.

General Comments

This section lists the general comments when asked, "Do you have other comments or suggestions?"

-only small numbers can participate in woodwork and hobbyshop (2)

-should be told rules (3)

-rules should be consistently enforced (3)

-escorted visits to hospital should be permitted when family member sick (2)

-activities so people don't just sit around

-maximum visits behind glass are degrading (4)

-why do people convicted of theft do more time than people who are in for sexual assault

-treated well here (3)

-society should take that extra step to see me as a person

-very small, can't get away from people

-more gym time

-delays in parole application (2)

-shortage of tobacco (3)

-earn money to buy tobacco, shampoo

-for short time it's okay

-delays in getting to see a counsellor

-gym time not the full hour

-should be able to earn good time for kitchen work

-not enough fresh air (6) "Fresh air relieves tension."

-non-smoking space (2)

-double punishment not fair, eg. hole and good time off (3)

-schedule inside programs for when outside activities are not happening

-guards should have counselling, bring moods inside (3).

STAFF

Thirty-two staff were interviewed including three at the Prince County Jail. Information from the Prince County interviews are not included here, but helped to provide general impressions. Staff were informed about the program review by a memo from the Director of Community and Correctional Services, and a notice on the staff room bulletin board. Interviews were voluntary and took place at the correctional centres during staff work time over a three week period in March, 1988.

Of the twenty-nine staff interviewed at the Provincial Correctional Centre twenty-two were men, and seven were women. Their job classifications were Correctional Officer I (3), Correctional Officer II (20), Correctional Officer III (1), Correctional Officer IV (1), and other staff were Classification Officer, Food Services Manager, Cook, and Nurse.

The length of time employed at the Provincial Correctional Centre ranged from less than one year (2) to since the Centre opened, over 9 years (11). The length of time for other staff was fairly evenly dispersed during the intervening years.

Staff ages are dispersed between under 30 to the 50 - 59 range, with the most (11) being in the 40 - 49 year range.

Most staff interviewed have completed at least grade 12 education (24), several by G.E.D., and 4 have graduated from college or university, and 9 have some college or university courses.

Courses and Training and Interests

Of the twenty-five Correctional Officers interviewed, twenty have completed Correctional Officer Training. Of the remaining five, two are Correctional Officer I positions, and three have graduated from the Atlantic Police Academy.

In addition to Correctional Officer training, some staff have completed a variety of courses including: Diploma in Recreation, sociology, psychology, supervision/management, public relations, human relations, suicide prevention, Police Academy, criminology, crisis intervention, Licenced Nursing Assistant, addictions, R.C.M.P. Auxiliary, Security Officer.

Staff were also asked what personal skills or interests they might bring to their work at the Correctional Centre. These included: recreation, sports, getting along with people, gardening, substitute teaching, interest in the law, carpentry, mechanics, mothering, music, bookkeeping, T.V. repair.

Major Functions of Job

Security is the first thought on the minds of most Correctional Officers, followed by counselling. Other functions mentioned were: being fair, trying to meet individual needs, safety, cleaning, ensuring programs take place, escorting, role modelling, staffing central control, admitting, and report preparation.

Major Positive Activities at Centre

When asked in their view, what major activities at the Centre help to change inmate behaviour staff reported: recreation/sports outside the Centre (9), impaired driver

program (6), A.A. program (4), education (5), chaplaincy (5), work outside (5), community service volunteer (3), woodwork shop (4), kitchen work (3), recreation generally (2). Other comments included: gym, activities away from the Centre, and not too much.

Activities that Could Happen

Staff were asked for their ideas on programs or activities that could happen that could positively influence behaviour. Education was the most often mention (15), ranging from basic remedial to G.E.D. preparation and life skills. Outside community service (charity work) was also considered an important influence on behaviour (8). Work related suggestions included setting up a small farm, including woods work (6), more outside work programs (2), and a full-time woodworking shop (5). Regarding recreation, staff suggested an outdoor rink for winter sports (4), and more community recreation (5). Further alcohol and drug treatment programs were considered essential by some staff, in addition to the impaired driver program. In the areas of counselling, assessment on admission and case planning were mentioned, as well as life skills (5), and involving more community people in activities like group discussions.

In addition to activity ideas many staff suggested an incentive system (behaviour modification), providing rewards of either money, earned time, or outside activities for positive behaviour. Also some staff commented that the

personality of the instructor seemed the most important aspect in terms of their ability to motivate inmates. An attitude of equal human treatment and no belittling behaviour.

Most Satisfying

Staff were asked to comment on the aspect of their work that they found most satisfying. The two most frequently mentioned were: working with inmates (8), and seeing change in behaviour (11). Other comments were: doing a good job, building relationships, glad to have a job, resolving inmate problems, getting through the day, and keeping busy.

Least Satisfying

Responses to the question of the least satisfying aspect of work varied with the most frequent comment being negativeness of the institution and no positive words from administration (6); following this were: shift work (3), inmates returning (3), hassles with inmates (3), lack of consistency in enforcing rules (2), no job satisfaction (2), forever having to cover yourself, menial tasks like cleaning, staff morale, breaking bad news to inmates, too much time doing nothing, and feeling unable to help inmates.

Change One Thing

If staff had the power to change one thing related to inmates at the Correctional Centre most staff would have more programs (11), and also a full-time rehabilitation

program, and educational program (2). Change would include establishing a system of motivation and reward (3), consistency in enforcing the rules and regulations (3), more programs that family members could participate in, less restriction of movement within the building, counselling on the units, no overcrowding, give inmates less and make time harder, move the Female Unit into a secure house downtown, provide hope, change society's attitude so there would not need to be a Correctional Centre.

Staff Training

Staff were asked what specific courses or training they would like to help them to be more effective in their work. The most frequently mentioned was human relations/ counselling training (12), followed by Correctional Officer refresher (5), drug/alcohol training (2), suicide prevention (3), job stress related to working inside (2), orientation for new staff (eg. designated trainer and training kit) (2), investigations/statement taking, dealing with red-tape of government, improving morale and team work, self-defence/how to restrain, public speaking, riot control, psychiatric assessment (nurse), medical emergencies like d.t.'s, seizures, suicide attempts, and rights of staff and inmates.

General Comments

Other comments and suggestions of staff are listed as stated:

-inmates should be rewarded for the work they do (4)

-assign a correctional officer staff to a small number of inmates to follow case plan program

-new staff should be trained by a qualified trainer and evaluated before being placed in job

-consistency is important (5)

-want feedback about work performance, suggestions made, pat on back for good work (5)

-inmate committee

-suggest putting overall program in place by 1992, and saying, this is the training you need, do it

-involve correctional officers in long-term planning

-poor staff morale affects inmates (7)

-negative atmosphere

-improve communication between management and staff (3)

-train some C.O. II's in programs like recreation, and other activities

-yearly meeting of correctional officer staff with Director of Community and Correctional Services and Custody Manager

-psychological services to develop therapeutic case plan

-no upward mobility or other incentive for staff

-more inmate involvement in the community/repaying the community somehow

-regular, honest, fair staff evaluations

-proper staff lounge

-flexible work hours meeting centre requirements but permitting staff to meet individual needs such as university courses, coaching kid's hockey (2)

-classify some matron positions even just permanent part-time

-recommend a separate women's centre

COMMUNITY

A letter was sent by the Director of Community and Correctional Services to 52 people with some involvement at the Correctional Centre. Twenty-six of these people were interviewed either in person or by telephone. (See Appendix B - Community Organizations Represented)

Relationship to Centre

The largest group of people interviewed with involvement at the Correctional Centre are through the chaplaincy program (9), 8 participate or participated because of their work in a community or government agency, 3 of these people were employment related. Others are employed in the justice system (4), Department of Social Services (1), or formerly involved as Correctional Officers (2), former jail physician, and one person as a concerned citizen. Seven people interviewed were women, and 19 men.

Length of Time Involved

Six people have maintained their involvement since the Centre opened in 1979, and 6 people have been involved for a year or less. Five people have no direct involvement in the Centre or its programs, and the remainder have participated for several years - three years (3), four years (2), six years (3), and eight years (1).

Direct Participation in Programs

The chaplaincy program provides most volunteers in direct program participation: academic/educational (4), spiritual/religious progammes (5), individual counselling and welfare such as helping an inmate to get clothes for a wedding. Others participate through their employment in individual or group counselling, including self-esteem building program, addictions, employment. One person does a part-time education program through his work, and two administer out-of-centre work programs through their employment. One family volunteers their time to do first aid training.

Major Positive Activities at Centre

Community representatives considered the alcohol programs (9), and educational programs (6) the most helpful. These were followed by chaplaincy (3), recreaton (3), community service volunteer work (2), hobbies (2), out-of-centre activities (2) woodwork, kitchen, personal counselling,

personal connection with staff/volunteers, and first aid. Five people were not sufficiently familiar with programs to comment, and two responded that there was not much available.

Activities that Could Happen

When asked what activities could happen at the Correctional Centre to positively influence inmate behaviour people responded by suggesting program ideas as well as suggestions about process, staff, facilities and drugs. Regarding programs: 11 people suggested a proper educational program ranging from literacy through to G.E.D. preparation, professional counselling including individual and group counselling was suggested 9 times; and other program suggestions included life skills training (4), alcohol programs (4), pre-release preparation (2), work preparation through outside work programs (3), community service volunteer (2), and hobbies (1)

Regarding an approach to programs people suggested a reward system of time-off, money, or outside activities (3), building self-esteem through productivity, increased use of community resources, compulsory participation, and more attention to scheduling programs so they do not conflict. Further suggestions were made regarding more support and training for staff, adding portable buildings to make more space for programs, more screening to reduce drugs at the

Centre, and consideration of special needs groups such as Native people and women.

Most Satisfying

Relationships with inmates was identified as the most satisfying aspect of community involvement at the Correctional Centre (5). Other responses were: seeing a glimmer of hope (2), asked to return to do program, potential of inmates (2), change in inmate attitude, when people don't return (2), helpful staff (2), and not too many rewards. Nine people were not sufficiently involved to comment, and others had no response.

Least Satisfying

The physical and material resources to work with at the Centre were considered the least satisfying by five people. Staff morale and the need for training was mentioned twice, and other comments were: communication breakdown with staff regarding arrangements, unjust sytem of punishment within Centre, lack of motivation, getting professional mental health services, availability of drugs, conflict of schedule with other programs. Again a large number (12) either had no response either because of their limited involvement or they had no comment to this question.

Change One Thing

In response to the question "If you had the power to change one thing at the Centre, related to inmates, what would you

change?", community representatives responded: find community alternatives to incarceration (2), close up the hole as punishment, general attitude toward inmates, availability of professional counselling, attitude of some inmates, provide a classroom, environmental situation outside the centre such as families, stop access to drugs, more freedom of movement inside, more access to community, staff training, more activities, separate unit for remand, focus on rehabilitation, life skills, have drug/alcohol treatment at beginning of sentence, more space for programs. Seven people were not sufficiently aware of the Centre to respond.

Prepared to Assist with Activities

Community people were asked if there were any activities they would like to become involved in/more involved in, and their responses were:

-will start tutoring four afternoons a week soon

-involve students from Holland College, Law and Security course

-consider some kind of contract for professional services

-maybe when retired

-develop work programs such as farm labour and stream management (2)

-trying to work out arrangements for mental health counselling

-see people while at the hospital (rarely have a referral)

-make Turning Point counselling more available

-public education to change community consciousness that prison is not effective/efficient approach

-group discussions with inmates/community people

-probation assistance in classification process

-some counselling with inmates

-if circumstances permit, Reality Therapy training for staff

-may assist with community service volunteer program

-discuss doing community service volunteer program again

General Comments

Under the category of general comments and suggestions community people stated:

-check School Act to see if the Department of Education has a responsiblity to provide education up to age 20

-more training for staff (8)

-music would add "life"

-Centre appears clean and orderly

-change public attitudes

-provide incentives to get out and work

-improve ability to do assessments, especially for sex offenders

-provide incentive to participate in education program

-approach Association of Social Workers to see if they would establish a volunteer program for retired social workers

-assess hearing and sight, correct where possible - improves attitude and behaviour

-review remand situation (2)

-clean up drugs (2)

-if chaplaincy appreciated, keep that hour free of other programs

-more communication between correctional officers and community corrections

-more programs with outside contact

-correctional officers and volunteers should get together to exchange information about roles

-in past year the atmosphere seems to have improved.

Response to Discussion Paper

Twenty-one people completed the response form sent with the discussion paper of interview results. Twelve staff expressed an interest in attending the program review meeting and added the comments:

-more emphasis on female unit programs

-treatment programs for sex offenders

-system and staff crying out for help, let's start.

Nine community people responded with interest in attending the meeting and commented:

-excellent survey

-establish a community advisory committee

-St. John Ambulance will continue first aid training

-comments of inmates and staff should be basis for developing more positive atmosphere, and staff training.

PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING

Twenty-eight people attended a full-day program review meeting on May 6, 1988. (See Appendix C, Agenda, and Appendix D, List of Participants.)

The purpose of the meeting was to identify and develop program ideas for Department of Justice consideration, with the caution that these were ideas for consideration in the report and not necessarily recommendations.

Opening

Julie Devon Dodd introduced the purpose of the day as part of the process of a review of programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre which she is carrying out under contract with the Department of Justice. Phil Arbing, Director of Community and Correctional Services, spoke further about this meeting as part of a process of review, and the uniqueness of the participation aspect of the process which includes many staff, inmates, and concerned community members.

Purpose of the Correctional Centre

Meeting participants brainstormed their ideas on the purpose of the Correctional Centre, listing the following:

- protection of society
- rehabilitation
- punishment
- raise self-esteem

- provide shelter for inmates
- carry out orders imposed by the court
- life skills
- build-up, rather than break-down
- addiction education
- assessments
- basic needs - physical and psychological health care
- symbol of accountability for our actions
- shorter time, longer probation
- habilitation
- place to learn new positive skills
- continuing family involvement
- return to society with new attitudes
- learn to read and write.

The list was priorized and summarized as - the purpose of the Correctional Centre is:

-to protect society by carrying out the orders of the court,

-to meet the basic individual needs of food, shelter, and health care,

-to provide an opportunity for motivation to change attitudes and behaviour,and

-to be a symbol of accountability for our actions as a community.

In addition to this working definition for the day, participants identified the fixed realities of the

Correctional Centre:

- inmates have no choice in being there
- basic freedom of movement is taken away
- staff and administration have no control over who is there or for how long (changes in law affects this)
- the physical layout and location of the centre
- inmates are adults, over 18
- the number of women resident at the Centre is very low.

Most Important Aspects of Focus for the Day

Using a concensus building exercise (talking in groups of 3, then 6, then 12, then whole group), participants identified what they considered the most important aspects of focus. The discussion paper, and personal experience provided the background information for this priorizing.

The following areas were identified:

- drug control
- attitude of correctional staff
- counselling (by 2 groups), addictions treatment
- structuring inmate days
- education (by 2 groups)
- special needs of female inmates
- program and operations management, including management structures and staff training

- case planning and assessment (by 2 groups), and
- employment, community service, leisure, spiritual.

From this list five major areas were identified:

- **Case planning**, including assessment and classification,
- **Education**
- **Addictions**
- **Counselling**, and
- **Employment, Community Service and Leisure.**

Developing Areas of Focus

Meeting participants divided into groups based on their interest in a specific area of focus with instructions to develop the approach or activity by **purpose** (big picture, related to the world, visionary), **objectives** (specific, definable, present), **activities** (how to reach objectives), and **who** (suggestions on who might do this).

The following reports on the developmental work by interest groups as presented to the meeting.

CASE PLANNING/MANAGEMENT

Purpose: to develop a case plan for the inmate and staff for the duration of the inmate's sentence.

Objective: to develop a case management process for the institution/community contacts that is reasonable and attainable within the time allotted.

Activities:
what - case plan should be holistic, including basic personal information, criminal record, present sentence, pscyho/social assesments,

when - case plan should be completed within 7 days for those serving a sentence of 30 days or more,
- orientation for all inmates must occur within 24 hour period upon admission,
- case conference should be held every 30 days.

who - a staff person would act as support/co-ordinator to 6 or 8 "unit counsellors" and other medical and programming individuals. ("Unit Counsellors" would be correctional officers trained in case management and assigned a caseload within the unit.)

EDUCATION

Purpose: in order to function one has to have an education - education involves addressing the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of the person (holistic approach).

Objectives:
A. -bring illiterates to literacy
B. -bring literates to higher level
C. -develop self-esteem/positive image
D. -motivate and challenge the person to desire change
E. -recognize accomplishment
F. -prepare individuals to function in the community.

Activities: (relate to objectives)

A. Literacy
- -Laubach Literacy Program (for adults)
- -library
- -positive environment (newspapers, magazines)
- -mobile library
- -classroom instruction (gr. 5 level)

B. Higher Level
- -G.E.D. exams
- -university
- -Holland College
- -high school
- -computer program (Holland College)
- -library, educational materials
- -mobile library
- -environment

C. Develop Self-Esteem
- -personality and human relations
- -life skills program
- -staff attitude/physical environment
- -community involvement

-addictions program
-spiritual program
-counselling

D. Motivate to Desire Change
-counselling
-staff attitude/behaviour/example
-emphasis on positive
-aptitutde testing/vocational information
-recognition for accomplishments

E. Recognize Accomplishments
-certificates
-verbal communication/affirmation

F. Preparation for Community
-life-skills
-computer awareness
-personality and human relations
-woodworking
-addictions
-cooking
-G.E.D./educational programs
-use of leisure time/cultural appreciation
-counselling
-spiritual.

ADDICTIONS

Purpose: prevention of future incarceration

Objectives:
-identification of problem (education)
-motivation

Activities: Treatment
-community self-help groups, inside and outside
-broaden scope of present programs (impaired driver) to encompass any alcohol or drug related offender

Who: -anyone qualified in the area of addictions (assessment and counselling).

COUNSELLING

Purpose: to promote good mental, spiritual, and social health

Objective: better functioning human being

Activities:
-proper assessment by trained individual to identify needs on admission

-appropriate referral (referral sources - pastoral, psychological, psychiatric [crisis and long-term], sex therapist, social workers, vocational, addictions)
-interested correctional officer staff could be trained for basic counselling.

EMPLOYMENT/COMMUNITY SERVICE/LEISURE

Purpose: to improve inmate's character and develop positive member of society

Objectives:
-to change their thinking and how they react to life situations
-to develop a sense of responsiblity and self-worth
-to eliminate repeat offenders
-to develop an appreciation of society's lifestyle
-to develop/insure inmate has a means to contribute to society by self-support in positive sense

Activities:
-structure days to include active and passive activities - meaningful work, self improvement, community service and integration (work ethic - work before play, reward for work)
-activities could be within building, on-site, and in the community, and for short and long-term inmates.

Barriers to Improved Programming

Following the presentation of program development ideas participants identified some of the barriers to improved programming:

-illicit drug availability

-lack of sufficient and qualified staff for programming and case planning

-for correctional officers (if role is to be expanded), present job descriptions, training, staffing schedules, incentive

-acceptance by some staff

-lack of structure in terms of case planning and daily activities.

Summary of Program Review Meeting

The program review meeting provided an opportunity for Correctional Centre staff, volunteers, other community members, and Justice administrators to discuss issues related to programming at the Provincial Correctional Centre. Several participants commented that this was a valuable experience, valued the open discussion and concern, and appreciated ideas from people outside the institution.

In terms of follow-up, a written summary of the meeting was sent to participants with an opportunity to respond if errors or interpretation needed revision. Some meeting participants would like to be included in further discussion of the barriers as part of an implementation process, and further suggested a yearly evaluation of programs at the Correctional Centre.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION AND ISSUES

There are three major factors which influence programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre - inmates, staff, and the system. While the inter-relationship of these factors must be included in programming consideration, it may be helpful to consider each area to better understand some of the related issues.

Inmates

The number of inmates resident at the Provincial Correctional Centre fluctuates. During June of 1987 it was not unusual to have 100 inmates at the Centre. This year a number in the mid-fifties is more likely. While the number of inmates is relatively small, fluctuating numbers and varied length of stay presents a major programming problem. In addition to sentenced and remand inmates, lock-up inmates require special attention and place demands on the institution because of their short-stay and need for constant observation. (See Lock-up Study - Public Drunkenness Offenders, November, 1987)

For sentenced inmates, their stay at the Correctional Centre can range from one day, (usually for fine default [alternatives under consideration] or impaired driving), to sixteen months, (a two year sentence, release after two-thirds of the sentence is served). For the thirty-six sentenced inmates interviewed during this review, seventeen

were serving sentences in excess of one year, and a further seven, were serving sentences of six months or longer. Over sixty per cent had previously been incarcerated, and over ninety per cent reported using alcohol and/or drugs on the day of the offence.

The average age of the interviewed inmates was 27.6 years. The average self-reported education of the group interviewed was grade 9, however it is expected that the functional educational level is somewhat lower. Few of the men interviewed had primary relationships or work attachments in the community.

The majority of inmates are white males incarcerated for property or drinking and driving offences. Small numbers of special populations are usually resident at the Correctional Centre at any one time, including - women, Native people, remand inmates, and sex offenders.

Staff

The equivalent of approximately 75 people are employed at the Provincial Correctional Centre, including 5 administration, 1 Classification, 4 kitchen, 8 matrons, 3 casual, 1 laundry, 1 stores, 1 part-time woodwork instructor and 48 correctional officers, including 5 supervising Correctional Officers III.

Correctional officers staff the centre 24 hours a day in a standard eight-hour shift schedule, (except weekends which are twelve-hour shifts) including one Correctional Officer III, and two or three Correctional Officers II in each of the three sentence units and admitting/lock-up unit, and a matron in the female unit. Other staff involved in programs usually work an eight-hour Monday-Friday schedule, including the Deputy Superintendent (Correctional Officer IV), the Classification Officer, the Food Services Manager, and part-time woodwork instructor, stores and laundry.

Almost all Correctional Officer staff identified security as the major function of their correctional officer role, followed by counselling or helping inmates. Training and guidelines for the security function of the job seem to be in place. Of the Correctional Officers II interviewed, most have taken the Correctional Officer training and the three who have not are graduates of Police Officer training at the Atlantic Police Academy. Standing orders direct most aspects of life at the Correctional Centre. Correctional Officers identified human relations type training most often when asked what other courses or training would be helpful. There is not a clearly defined philosophy, principles, or guidelines for Correctional Officer involvement with inmates outside of the security function, even though the rehabilitation aspect was established as the foundation program at the Correctional Centre and is identified as

forty per cent of the Correctional Officer II job description.

Correctional Officers identified positive change in inmate behaviour as the most satisfying aspect of their work. This factor combined with the rate of recidivism resulted in expressed frustration in the work of correctional officer staff. The least satisfying aspect of the work for several correctional officer staff was the negativeness of the institution, and the perceived lack of support from the administration both in consistency in the enforcement of rules, and positive feedback for a job done well.

The overall impression of correctional officer staff is for the most part, of a group of intelligent, capable, caring people, experiencing a fair degree of frustration and lack of job satisfaction.

System

The Provincial Correctional Centre is the primary rehabilitation institution in the province, and receives inmates from across the province, working in direct relationship with Prince County Jail. The Correctional Centre is also related to the broader criminal justice system in its relationship to the courts, police, parole, and probation. The Correctional Centre is funded by public tax revenues, and ultimately guided by the laws approved by

elected representatives. It has a relationship to the community as a whole.

A Correctional Centre is a relatively closed system with highly controlled movement in and out. Inmates, while some may argue have choice at the time they commit an offence, are punished by the loss of their freedom of movement. These two factors - a closed system, and the negative attitudes imposed by lack of choice are major obstacles to a dynamic rehabilitation approach. Efforts to keep the institution open in relation to the broader criminal justice system and the community are necessary to help balance this, recognizing consequences related to security that require attention.

The classification and points systems presently operating at the Correctional Centre tend to a security rather than a rehabilitation focus. The systems work on a supposedly objective number basis - the length of stay in the maximum unit is related to the length of sentence, earned remission time is related to a point system. There is a tendency for the "numbers game" to take precedence over behaviour and rehabilitation approaches.

Consideration of programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre, and in the provincial correctional system must include the rehabilitation needs of inmates, the training and job satisfaction needs of staff, recognize the

atmosphere imposed by a negative closed system, and encourage a relationship to the larger community. A philosophy of corrections which combines rehabilitation of the sentenced offender with the security requirements of protection of the community are accepted p inciples of the criminal justice system and the community.

The initial principle of dynamic security and staffing envisioned by the initiators of the Correctional Centre does not appear to have been supported by sufficient staff training and program direction, resulting now in lack of intention or planning in relation to inmates and programs. This present review along with other activities of the past two years - the Lock-up Study, Fine Option Study (recommending alternatives for default), Drinking and Driving Study, efforts to deal with overcrowding, staffing, space and budget limitations-are an indication of administration and government desire to improve the situation.

The problem areas most frequently identified during interviews and the program review meeting are related to inmate needs - alcohol and drug addiction, individual and group counselling, and basic education; staff development - training, morale, and opportunities for personal growth; and the institutional system - a rehabilitation program with a case management approach, drug control, and scheduling of volunteer programs.

The purpose of this study was a review of present programs and the question becomes given the provincial custodial corrections system, the physical structure of the Provincial Correctional Centre and its relationship to other adult facilites, the needs of the inmates, and the resources of staff and community, what changes could improve programs at the Correctional Centre, ultimately leading toward a goal of reducing re-admissions to provincial correctional facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

The facility and program designers of the Provincial Correctional Centre envisioned dynamic security, (security that is active as opposed to static, fixed, or rigid) based on inmate involvement in programs at the Correctional Centre and in the community, and on the relationship of inmates and correctional officer staff. A variety of valuable programs and helping relationships do happen to the benefit of some inmates. However, there is no overall rehabilitation model with a defined helping relationship approach to guide the work in adult provincial correctional centres.

The recommendations for consideration are in two major areas:

- areas for immediate consideration including control of drugs, scheduling of existing programs, review of classification and point systems, and staff training, and

- a program development approach with the long-term goal of reducing the number of repeat offenders at the provincial correctional centre by developing a model program for inmates in the provincial correctional system.

Areas for Immediate Consideration

Areas for immediate consideration include suggestions which can be relatively easily implemented with some immediate effects on programming - a review of classification and

point system leading to basic sentence planning for inmates serving more than sixty days, and scheduling of existing programs; and other areas requiring attention - control of drugs, and staff training.

Review of Classification and Point System

Inmates serving more than sixty days are held in the maximum unit for two to six weeks depending upon the length of their sentence: sixty days to one year - two weeks, up to fifteen months - four weeks, up to two years - six weeks. It is recommended that a simple sentence planning form be developed by the classification officer and completed for inmates on the maximum unit, within two weeks of their admission, and that this be the basis for discussion and decision making at the weekly classification meetings.

A point system, for Correctional Officer staff to provide information on inmate behaviour, is used to make decisions about earned privileges such as remission, temporary absence, and outside programs. The basic purpose and effectiveness of the point system should be reviewed to determine if staff are aware of and use guidelines for awarding points , and if the point system is completed on an objective and regular basis.

Review of the point system is seen as a short-term measure, and a system of incentives related to sentence planning and

identifiable behaviour should replace the present point system as a model rehabilitation program develops.

Scheduling of Existing Programs

The problem of program scheduling and use of space was identified by community participants at the Correctional Centre. It is recommended that the Classification Officer identify ongoing programs at the Centre and schedule times and locations to reduce the possibility of conflict of time and space. Present and future programming at the Correctional Centre is to a large extent dependent upon community/institution relations, and improvement in this area will facilitate future program development.

Control of Drugs

The problem of access to drugs at the Provincial Correctional Centre was identified by one inmate, some community members, and during the program review meeting. The extent of drug access and use is unknown, however the frequency with which it is mentioned, and the effect on rehabilitation efforts encourages a recommendation for drug control through security, staff training regarding present policy and to identify when inmates are using drugs, awareness programs for inmates, and a Correctional Centre policy with clear and enforced consequences for drug use.

The control of drugs is seen as preparatory to program development.

New security efforts have been initiated, and these can be supported by staff training to identify when inmates are using drugs and guidelines to staff about their responsibility in enforcing the punishment consequences of drug use. Education and awareness programs for inmates related to drug and alcohol addiction should be made available to all inmates, and could be run by Correctional Officers with addiction information, and support from Addiction Services.

Staff Training

Human relations/counselling training was the most frequently identified training need by staff. This training should be done in conjunction with the development of a rehabilitation model for the Correctional Centre, which should include a specific human relations model.

In the meantime, it is recommended that consideration be given to short courses of a crisis management nature, for example:

- signs/symptoms, and crisis management of alcohol and drug abuse,
- signs/symptoms of serious mental disturbance, and crisis intervention, including suicide prevention.

Strategy for Long-Term Program Development

A dynamic model of custodial corrections would be based on:

- a sentence plan for all inmates,
- an approach for inmate/correctional officer relationship, and
- development of in-house and community programs.

It is recommended that the Department of Justice adopt a program development approach to develop a model rehabilitation program for inmates in the Provincial Correctional System.

The goal of a program development approach would be development of a rehabilition model which reduces the number of repeat offenders at provincial correctional centres. Ideally, this would be part of a statement of principles, or mission statement for correctional centres, reflecting an overall Departmental approach to adult corrections.

The objectives of the approach would include:

-identification of factors contributing to incarceration,

-involvement of community agencies in rehabilitation at the correctional centres, in the community and on release,

-addiction education, self-awareness, and community awareness programs for short-term inmates,

-addiction education, self-awareness, community awareness, education, employment and skills training, and pre-release programs for longer term inmates.

There are a number of factors which encourage the development of this model:

- the existence of the present resources including physical facilities at the Provincial Correctional Centre, the concerned staff, and the close relationship of the correctional centres and the inmates to the broader community,

- the size of the province and the relatively small number of inmates, staff, community volunteers and professionals who would participate in the approach,

- the range of time inmates are resident at the correctional centres (1 day to sixteen months), and some of the common factors such as addiction,

- the idea of self-fulfilling prophecy, which states that people live-up to the behaviour expected of them by people in authority,

- the apparent provincial government interest in continuing to develop meaningful programs for adult offenders,

- the possibility of Federal government interest and support in the developmental phase of this model.

A one year program development phase is recommended to introduce a dynamic rehabilitation approach to custodial corrections. This program development phase could be guided by a committee of justice administration, correctional centre staff, and community representation with support from an experienced full-time or part-time program developer. This core committee should be no larger than eight people with the mandate and authority to develop the rehabilitation model. Small working groups with specific expertise and community interest could work on aspects of the program development.

There are four major activities that would take place during the program development phase:

- living-unit organization
- sentence planning
- staffing
- program development.

Living Unit Organization

Within the custodial part of the institution the living units are divided by function and security. Function includes admitting/lock-up and the female unit, and security encompasses maximum, medium, and minimum units. The delineation of units by security only should be reviewed with consideration to a move away from the security definition to living units structured by function. This

redefining would encourage a more dynamic security approach based on inmate needs, and staff function.

For example the admitting/lock-up unit could remain to admit inmates, receive and store personal belongings, issue clothing, and the female unit could remain to provide a physically separate space for women, and develop a rehabilitation and sentence plan approach to female residents. In addition consideration could be given to functions of:

- assessment/special needs unit (eg. inmates in need of more secure physical arrangements and staff trained in observation and assessment),

- a short-term unit (eg. inmates serving sentences of six months or less who would participate in standardized programs related to alcohol, self-awareness, and community awareness, and staff trained in a reality-therapy type of human relations approach and educated about addictions and community resources.)

- a longer-term unit (eg. inmates serving sentences ranging from six months to two years who would participate in standardized programs similar to or integrated with the short-term unit for the early part of their sentence, but with more emphasis on individual case planning and programs and pre-release preparation, and staff trained to include group interaction and discussion as well as reality-therapy type of human relations.)

Sentence Planning

An initial sentence plan should be developed for inmates within seven days of their admission. The purpose of sentence planning is to identify inmates security requirements, inmate needs, and to develop and deliver individual programs. The extent of sentence planning depends on the length of sentence, although a sentence plan for all inmates is desirable. The basics of sentence planning would be constant for all inmates, but the extent of assessment and program development would be based on the length of stay and legal status.

An initial sentence planning format for all sentenced inmates would include:

1. Background information regarding offence, sentence, and other information such as previous incarceration, education, employment, family relationships etc. from files available at the correctional centre and other criminal justice files, and interviews with the inmate.

2. Orientation to the correctional centre.

3. Assessment of inmate needs (eg. physical/emotional health, addiction, etc. based on inmate interviews, observation, and contacts with family and others in the criminal justice and social service system).

4. Sentence plan related to goals for changing the behaviour which contributed to the offence, and identifying required participation in institutional programs including

the number of hours per day/week, and consequences of participation or non-participation. This part of the sentence plan would form a contract with the inmate.

5. Identified times and methods for reviewing the sentence plan.

6. Discharge plans.

A simple sentence planning form of two or three pages could be completed within two to seven days of admission. For longer term inmates the initial sentence plan would include further assessment related to the identified inmate needs. The sentence plan would be developed in communication with the inmate and form a contract with goals in the sentence plan related to incentives - eg. earned remission time, participation in activities outside the centre, etc.

Consistency of expected behaviours and consequences is an important factor in sentence planning, and a written format, developed and reviewed with the inmate, also makes that information available to other staff at the correctional centre. It is desirable to increase the possibility of consistency by having one person responsible for development, evaluation, and changes related to the individual sentence plan, in consultation with others such as inmate, family, probation, other correctional centre staff, and other community based professionals, (eg. Mental Health, Education, Addictions).

Staffing

The generic role of the correctional officer envisioned by the original planners of the Provincial Correctional Centre program included - security, admitting, living unit supervision, correspondence, recreation, counselling, work crew supervision and escorting. The majority of staff at the correctional facilities are Correctional Officers II, and the purpose of their job is to maintain security and assist inmates in reaching their rehabilitative goals; the object of the position is to provide security while assisting the rehabilitation of inmates. The rehabilitation aspects of the job description include identification of needs, information gathering, counselling, assistance and direction.

The responsibility for classification and program development presently falls on the Classification Officer, and the correctional officer staff are primarily security oriented. **A major shift in emphasis to dynamic security requires that all staff participate in the rehabilitation aspect of corrections.** A model for staffing is needed to support the concept of rehabilitation including sentence planning, and this could reasonably be done within present staffing budgets, with additional initial resources required for the developmental phase, and training of staff.

The training and development of Correctional Officers II in the rehabilitation aspect of their job would provide more meaningful employment while benefiting the overall rehabilitation objective of custodial corrections. A return to the principle of dynamic security through correctional officer/inmate relationship necessitates training all correctional officers for that role. Consideration of generic training for staff in corrections would provide opportunities for mobility amongst different job categories and divisions within the Department.

This model begins with the premise that security at the Centre is in place, and that basic inmate safety needs are being met. The staffing model involves a Program Development/Staff Development function, and Living Unit staff, with special responsibility for sentence plan development and management.

Program Development/Staff Development Function: A person would be responsible for maintaining the dynamic relationship of correctional officers and inmates through the development of programs within the institution and the community, and the ongoing training and support of staff in their rehabilitative role with inmates. This necessitates the functions of security and programming being integrated to enhance the concept of dynamic security.

Correctional Officers with Responsibility for Sentence Plan Management : Living Unit officers with special training would be assigned the responsibility of ensuring that sentence plans were developed and followed. For example, two officers per unit (including female), trained in the area of focus for the unit, could provide consistency in sentence plan implementation and monitoring, with other unit staff managing the sentence plan on an individual basis.

Correctional Officers: All correctional officers would be trained in the rehabilitation aspects of their role and participate in inmate programs.

Program Development

Development of programs at the Correctional Centre includes individual program development, group program development, and staff development/support. Individual program development is directly related to the sentence plan of the inmate. (For example education and treatment programs for sex offenders need to be developed. An individual program may include weekly psychiatric counselling.) Group program development is a method of meeting the needs of individuals where there are common factors which may best be served in groups. (For example, the majority of offenders interviewed have a problem with alcohol. Group programs could be developed to provide awareness and education to all inmates where alcohol or drugs were present at the time of the

offence. Or programs on the living units, could include conflict resolution or problem solving.) Staff development/support in the program development context relates to the individual and group programs which require communication with staff both in identifying the inmate program needs, and identifying the ongoing training needs of staff to effectively carry out the rehabilitation function.

The present programs at the Correctional Centre provide a good foundation for future development. For example:

- the Impaired Driver program, evaluated favourably by inmates and staff provides a model for an expanded addictions program,
- the woodworking shop and kitchen provide programs for learning positive work related behaviours and some skills training,
- the community service volunteer program provides a sense of self-worth by participating with people less fortunate, and exposure to community services,
- the summer recreation program provides an experience of team and individual leisure possibilities,
- Fish and Wildlife, woodlot management and stream improvement, provides community work experience.
- new initiatives in education, addiction, and community service programs.

There is an apparent desire on the part of community members involved in this review to continue or expand their involvement at the correctional centre. Because of the relatively short-term nature of incarceration in the province, and the close proximity to the home community, development of programs involving existing community programs and services would have a number of benefits. Maintaining a strong community/correctional centre relationship not only develops and improves programs to meet individual sentence plan objectives, but maintains a relationship between the inmate and possible community resources on release. Also a dynamic community/institution relationship helps to minimize the negative atmosphere of the institution.

Programs should be designed based on individual needs or identified group needs. The general profile of inmates, the relatively small number of inmates at certain times, and the physical resources of the Provincial Correctional Centre preclude the development of major in-house programs. The advantage of this is the necessity of relying on community programs which strengthen the community/institution relationship, and put the inmate in contact with community services for possible future use. The disadvantage is lack of space for programs. For example the gym is really an activity centre, and there is no space in the institution for team sports such as volleyball, or for trades type

activities such as autobody repair. If programs are identified that require additional space, the adding of outside buildings such as the current woodwork shop is an option.

Program development should be the responsibility of a Program Development/Staff Development person in co-operation with the Correctional Officers responsible for Sentence Plan Management. This responsiblity would include building and maintaining communication and relationships with community professionals and volunteers.

Activities that encourage community participation at the Correctional Centre should be introduced, and include:

- developing and updating a resource binder of community professionals and volunteers and the types of individual and group programs they are prepared to offer in the institution or community,
- holding regular (once or twice a year) meetings at the Correctional Centre of community participants to recognize and appreciate them for their contribution and to exchange information with Correctional Centre staff.

Proposed Implementation Plan for Development of a Model Rehabiliation Program

An intensive development plan is essential to implement a rehabilitation approach in the provincial correctional system. This planning should include justice

administrators, correctional centre staff (including Prince County Jail), and community representatives with expertise in the areas of addictions, adult education, and counselling. The following outlines an implementation plan over a one year period, and is dependent upon government commitment to a basic rehabilitation program within provincial correctional facilities:

- Establish a program development committee to include justice administrators, correctional centre staff, and community representatives.

- Explore federal and provincial government resources to hire a program development person on contract for one year.

This program development process would enlarge on an implementation plan which would include:

- a redefinition of unit and program space at the Correctional Centre based on function,

- a sentence plan/case management approach to inmates,

- a staffing model which includes the rehabilitation role of Correctional Officer II job descriptions, sentence plan management functions and considers security and shift scheduling within the present resources,

- a counselling approach (eg. Reality Therapy) that could guide correctional officer/inmate relationships,

- development of training for staff,

- a supervision and administrative structure which values the rehabilitation as well as security functions of staff,

- a method for identifying and supporting community involvement, both individual volunteers and agencies, in correctional centre programming,

- identification of needs and programming ideas for special inmate groups including remand, and women,

-a step-by-step process of timing and information to staff so that a dynamic rehabilitation model is introduced with minimal disruption to the Centre,

-a procedure for ongoing evaluation of staff and assesment of programs.

The implementation of a program development approach to a model rehabilitation programme in the provincial correctional system will address many of the issues raised during this review.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This review of programs at the Provincial Correctional Centre has provided the opportunity for input from people most affected - inmates, staff, and involved community people. It has involved a process of communication and keeping people informed of the review as it progressed. The value of a process such as this is the diversity of information and ideas. The Summary and Recommendation sections of this report include the most important areas for consideration in the view of the writer. Many ideas in the Results of Interviews and Program Review Meeting sections are worthwhile, and are recorded for future consideration. The commitment and concern expressed by most staff and community members during this review are an indication of the potential for a dynamic rehabilitation program in the provincial correctional system.

The risk of a review such as this is the expectation of people who participated that their specific issues and recommendations will be considered, and that changes will occur automatically and immediately. This program review is a beginning, and a step in a process toward improved programs at the adult correctional centres.

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIONAL CENTRE REVIEW

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose: This questionnaire is voluntary and and is a guide for interviews conducted with inmates resident at the Provincial Correctional Centre on February 29, 1988. A review of Correctional Centre programmmes is underway, and this interview is an opportunity for inmates to express their views on programmes and specifically ideas for improving their own participation in preparation for release. The information will be included in a discussion paper for a meeting on programme evaluation, and in a report to the Department of Justice. Confidentiality is respected and names do not appear on the questionnaire.

Questionnaire No. _____

---

1. Demographic Information

a. Gender: male ____

female ____

b. Age: ____

c. Marital Status single ____

married (including common-law) ____

separated (including divorced) ____

widowed ____

d.. Significant relationships with: mother ____

father ____

spouse ____

non-married partner ____

children ____

other family (specify)_____ ____

others (specify) _____ ____

e. Education: highest grade completed ____

f. Spiritual: Do you practice a particular religion? yes ____

no ____

If yes, specify _____

g. Home community: West Prince ____

Prince ____

Summerside ____

Queens ____

Charlottetown ____

Southern Kings ____

Eastern Kings ____

Other (specify) _____ ____

2. Prior to Incarceration

a. What was your usual daytime activity?_____

_____

b. What was your usual evening/nighttime activity?

_____

3. Present Offence Information

a. Present Offence: _____

b. Date of Sentence: _____

c. Sentence: _____

other: _____

d. Release Date: _____

e. Were you using alcohol or other drugs on the day of the offence? no ___, yes ___, Specify _____

_____

4. Status At Institution

sentence ____
remand ____
transfer ____
lock-up ____

minimum ____
medium ____
maximum ____

length of sentence: days ____
months ____

5. Previous Incarceration

no _____
yes _____

If yes/# of times _____

when?_____

where?_____

why?_____

how long?_____

6. Name three things that take up most or your time here.

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

7. What programmes do you participate in? # hrs.week

Work (specify) _____ _____

Occupational (specify) _____ _____

Educational (specify) _____ _____

Recreational (specify) _____ _____

Counselling_____ _____

Religious _____ _____

Visiting _____ _____

Other _____ _____

8. If you don't participate in programmes, why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

9. What are your plans when you leave the centre?

Accommodation _____

Work _____

Education _____

Social _____

Family _____

10.What happens at the Correctional Centre to help you achieve your plans? _____

_____

_____

11. Name three things that could happen here that could help you to achieve your plans when you get out?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

12. Background Information

From this list, please check the ones that happened to you. (Would you prefer to do this yourself or have me read it?)

alcoholic mother ____

alcoholic father ____

physical abuse ____

sexual abuse ____

raised by someone other than parents ____

serious medical problem ____

treatment for alcohol addiction ___

treatment for drug addiction ___

family on welfare while growing up ___

previous criminal convictions ___

parents separated or divorced ___

self separated or divorced ___

lost custody of children ___

13. Would you like to add anything or make any other comments about the Correctional Centre?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date: _____ Interviewer: _____

CORRECTIONAL CENTRE REVIEW

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose: This questionnaire is voluntary and is completed by staff involved with inmate supervision or programmes. A review of Correctional Centre programmes is underway, and this questionnaire is intended to provide an opportunity for staff to express their views on programmes and specifically ideas for improving their own participation in Correctional Centre programmes. The information will be included in a discussion paper for a meeting on programmme evaluation, and in a report to the Department of Justice. Confidentiality is respected and names do not appear on the questionnaire.

Questionnaire No._____

---

1. Demographic Information

a. Job Title — CO 1 _____

CO 2 _____

CO 3 _____

Other (specify)_____ _____

b. Length of time at Centre _____years _____mths.

c. Gender — male _____

female _____

d. Age Bracket — under 30 _____

30 - 39 _____

40 - 49 _____

50 - 59 _____

60 and over _____

e. Education — highschool graduate _____

some college/university _____

college graduate _____

other (specify)_____ _____

f. Correctional Officer Training yes _____

no _____

If yes/ when _____

where _____

length of course _____

2, Have you taken any other training that is or could be helpful to yor job? _____

_____

_____

3. Do you have any particular skills or interests that you think could be useful to your work here? _____

_____

_____

_____

4. Describe three major functions of your job:

1._____

2._____

3._____

5. What inmate programmes do you directly participate in?

_____

_____

_____

6. In your opinion, what are the major activities at the Correctional Centre that help to change inmate behaviour?

_____

_____

_____

7. Name three activites that could happen at the Centre to positively influence inmate behaviour?

_____

_____

_____

8. What do you find the most satisfying about your work?

_____

_____

9. What do you find the least satisfying about your work?

_____

_____

10. If you had the power to change one thing related to inmates at the Centre, what would that be? _____

_____

_____

_____

11.What specific training could help you to be more effective in your job? _____

_____

_____

12.Any other comments or suggestions: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date: _____ Interviewer:_____

CORRECTIONAL CENTRE REVIEW

COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose: This questionnaire is a guide for interviews conducted with community people involved in or concerned about programmes at the Provincial Correctional Centre. A review of Correctional Centre programmes is underway and this interview is an opportunity for involved community members to express their views on programmes and specifically ideas for improvement. The information will be included in a discussion paper for a meeting on programme evaluation, and in a report to the Department of Justice. Confidentiality is respected and names do not appear on the questionnaire.

Questionnaire No._____

_____

1. a. Relationship to Correctional Centre _____

_____

_____

b. Length of time involved _____

c. Gender male _____

female _____

2. What inmate programmes do you participate in?_____

_____

_____

_____

3. In your opinion, what are the major activities at the Correctional Centre that help to change inmate behaviour?

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Name three activities that could happen at the Centre to positively influence inmate behaviour?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. What do you find the most satisfying about your involvement at the Correctional Centre?_____

_____

_____

6. What do you find the least satisfying? _____

_____

_____

7. If you had the power to change one thing related to inmates at the Centre what would that be?_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Are there specific activities that you would like to get involved in at the Centre or in relation to inmates on release? _____

_____ _____

_____

_____

9. Any other comments or suggestions?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date:_____ Interviewer:_____

APPENDIX B

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

Rev. Jacques Smith, Chaplaincy Program

Sr. Marguerite Mullally, Mount St. Mary's

Fr. Andrew MacDonald, Chaplaincy Program

Helen Flynn, Probation Services

Art Smith, Fish & Wildlife, Community and Cultural Affairs

Dick Hubley, Crown Prosecutor

Reg McKenna, Charlottetown Rural High School

Loran Fevens, Chaplaincy Program

Rev. Ross Howard, Queen El;izabeth Hospital

Dr. Leo Killorn, Queens County Addiction Services

Mike Fitzpatrick, Prince County Addiction Services

Bill Lawlor, Community Mental Health

Ron Taylor, Probation Services

Sr. Winnifred McIver, Mount St. Mary's

Carl Doucette, Probation Services

Bob Albert, Probation Services

Chet Campbell, Atlantic Police Academy

Col. Pat Wootton, Charlottetown Christian Council

Chief Jack Sark, Lennox Island

Chief W.J.R. Macdonald, Summerside Town Police

Gladys MacMillan, Canada Employment Centre

Sr. Mary Power, Catholic Family Services Bureau

Janice Morgan, St. John Ambulance

Helen Durie, Concerned Citizen

Eunice Wonnacott, Charlottetown Christian Council

Eric Hamill, Farm Labour Pool

Colin Campbell, Turning Point Group

APPENDIX C

PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE - PROGRAMME IDEAS MEETING

A G E N D A

Rodd's Royalty Inn, West Royalty, May 6, 1988

PURPOSE OF MEETING: TO IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP PROGRAMME IDEAS FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CONSIDERATION

9:30 a.m.	WELCOME/AGENDA REVIEW/PHIL ARBING, DIRECTOR OF CORRECTIONS/INTRODUCTIONS
10:00 a.m.	DEFINING THE PURPOSE OF THE CORRECTIONAL CENTRE
10:30 a.m.	IDENTIFYING THE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES/APPROACHES (Using Discussion Paper and Group Priorizing)
11:00 am.	DEVELOPING THE ACTIVITIES/APPROACHES IDENTIFIED (Small groups addressing purpose, what, where, and how of implementation)
12:00	LUNCH (Buffet provided at the Courtyard)
1:00	GROUPS REPORT BACK ON DEVELOPMENT WORK (Clarification/Questions from whole group)
2:15	BARRIERS AND SOLUTIONS TO SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION (Whole group)
3:30	NEXT STEPS
3:45	EVALUATION/CLOSING OF MEETING

APPENDIX D

CORRECTIONAL CENTRE REVIEW

Program Review Meeting - May 6, 1988, Rodd's Royalty Inn

Participants:

Correctional Centre Staff -

George Noble
Tom Clow
Kay Trainor
John O'Connor
Preston Robbins
Janice Morgan
Ruth McFarlane
Jordan Stewart
Garth Paynter
Daryl Nicholson

Others -

Carl Doucette, Probation Services
Helen Flynn, Probation Services
Sr. Kathleen Bolger, Kinkora Convent
Joan Duffy, Christian Council
Art Smith, Fish & Wildlife
Don Smith, Queen's County Addiction Services
Melodie Gay, John Howard Society
Fr. Jacques Smith, Chaplain
Staff Sgt. Brian Stevenson, R.C.M.P.
Craig MacDowell, Department of Justice
Reg McKenna, Charlottetown Rural High School
Sr. Winnifred McIvor, Mt. St. Mary's
Dr. Leo Killorn, Medical Advisor
Dr. Marjorie Smith, Physician
Eunice Wonnacot, Christian Council
Shirley Cole, Mann House
John Bruce, Department of Justice
Phil Arbing, Department of Justice

Chairperson -

Julie Devon Dodd